A CHAPTER OF FORGOTTEN HISTORY

BY
MUHAMMAD HANIF SIDDIQUI

REPRINTED FROM THE JOURNAL OF THE SINDH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
(Vol. 1, Part 1, 1934)

1934

Digitized by M. H. Panhwar Institute of Sindh Studies, Jamshoro.

Reprinted from

THE JOURNAL

OF

THE SIND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOL. I, PART I, MAY, 1934.

پاران ايم ايڇ پنهور انسٽيٽيوٽ آف سنڌ اسٽڊيز، ڄامشورو۔

Digitized by M. H. Panhwar Institute of Sindh Studies, Jamshoro.

A CHAPTER OF FORGOTTEN HISTORY

BY

SIDIKI MD HANIF, B. A. LL. B.

(Read on 25th February, 1934).

Though the first British official connection with Sind began in 1809 with the visit of the mission under Nicholas Hankey Smith[1], the "Unhappy Valley"[2] was known to the imperial adventurers and factors of the Honourable East India Company[3] and other European travellers long before that.

The fame of the valley as "very fruitful and pleasant, rich and fertile, almost as covetousness could wish"[4] had already gone far and wide. To the sixteenth and seventeenth century European travellers it was an El Dorado and Utopia of wealth beyond the dreams of avarice[5]—a garden of Avalon, where the happy consorts Peace and Prosperity reigned undisputed. But of all the places that gave Sind a proud position among the nations of the world[6] and wealth that tempted the cupidity of the West the chief was Thatha—the eye of Sind and the emporium of the East[7]. The city, one of the most commodious in India[8] and as large as London[9], was embellished with public buildings, beautiful gardens and aqueducts[10] that brought health and gave recreation to the citizens. Articles of trade and merchandise from all over the East were brought and landed at the very door of the merchants by means of canals[11] cut from the river four miles away. During the heat of summer or at night merchant-princes and rich officials retired to their villas in the island suburbs[12] to chase the flying hours with dance and music in the arms of their mistresses till they surrendered to the even more powerful charms of Morpheus.

---

1. Pottinger, *Travels*; Bruce, *Life of Sir C. Napier.*
2. Burton; Eastwick.
3. J. Abbott; Company's Records.
4. Terry.
5. J. Abbott.
6. J. Abbott.
7. Captain Payton.
8. Thevenot; Thomas Kerridge to E. I. C.; Tavernier; Withington.
9. Letter of instructions issued by the Company to her factors.
10. Pottinger.
11. Pottinger.
12. J. Abbott.

Forty thousand vessels[1] plied for hire at Thatha bringing men and merchandise from all quarters of the world; and it was here too, that the arts and sciences flourished. The loom was perfected and the indefatigable weaver worked day and night to produce calico, shawls, loongies of mixed gold, silk and cotton (supposed to be the 'zonae' of Periplus) for the princes and potentates of Central Asia and Hindustan. Captain Hamilton writes that at one time 80,000 weavers died of plague and famine. The artisans of Thatha were the most industrious in the kingdom of the Moghul[3]. The finest palanquins were manufactured at Thatha and there was nothing neater or more convenient than the chariots made there[4]. Nor was it backward in the pursuit of knowledge and cultivation of letters. The torch of learning was kept burning in the four hundred colleges[5] to which students from all parts of the country flocked to study theology, politics, philology[6], and humanities; and poets and divines gave a tinge of gravity and sanctity to the general atmosphere of gaiety. Mian Nur Mohamed Kalhora deplored that the blood-thirsty ruffian Nadir had despoiled him of his most precious books[7]. Such was Thatha in the prime of its glory and now the six mile cemetery containing not less than a million tombs[8] alone remains to remind us of its great past.

In 1607, the East India Company, for the first time, instructed their captain to extend their commercial activities to Sind. In 1613, Sir Robert Sherley and his company landed at Diul (Debal) and in 1635 the beginning of a factory was made at Thatha[9].

On 22nd September 1758, Ghulam Shah Kalhora[10] the ruler of Sind granted a '*parwannah*' to Mr. Sumption of the East India Company for the establishment of a factory in Sind with a view to encourage trade between Sind and Hindustan and cultivate friendly relations with the British. The permit was coupled with several valuable immunities and exemptions, for the enforcement of which orders were issued from time to time.[11] In 1761, on the arrival at his court of Mr. Erskine as Resident

1. J. Abbott.
2. Burton.
3. Mandelso.
4. Tavernier.
5. J. Abbott.
6. J. Abbott.
7. Will of Mian Nur Mahomed Kalhora. *MS.*
8. Kennedy.
9. J. Abbott.
10. Postans; Burton; Napier's *Conquest*; Hughes' *Gazetteer*, Aitkens, etc.
11. Postans.

for the affairs of the Company, Ghulam Shah issued another friendly *parwannah*[1] which ratified all the former advantages. The commercial connection continued uninterrupted until 1775, when owing to political excitement and upheaval, and the general insecurity consequent thereupon, the factory was withdrawn.[2]

In 1799, Abul Hassan, a native merchant, was deputed to reopen relations with the Sind Government, with the ostensible object of reviving trade, but in reality to counteract the alarming activities of Tippu Sultan and the French, and to anticipate the ambitious designs of Zaman Shah.[3] Mir Fateh Ali Khan, the founder of the Talpur dynasty, promised protection and privileges, wrote a flattering letter to the Governor and allowed Mr. Nathan Crow to build a house at Karachi. The agent, however, did not remain long, being suddenly ordered to quit Sind in pursuance of an order from Zaman Shah (as the Amir explained) or more probably, as Mr. Postans suggests, as a result of Tippu's intrigues with native traders. The matter was, however, dropped—presumably because the Sindhian question had ceased to be of importance owing to new conquests in the south.

During the years 1807 and 1808, the hostile schemes of Napoleon Bonaparte began to excite apprehension, and it was deemed necessary to send embassies to Persia, Kabul and Sind. In 1807 Mr. Seton entered into an offensive and defensive alliance[4] with Mirs Ghulam Ali, Karim Ali and Murad Ali on behalf of the Bombay Government; but the supreme Government refused to ratify it. "No sooner was this alliance formed than,—with that inconsistency and want of faith which has characterised all our dealings with the Amirs—a mission was despatched in 1809, to annul it."[5] On the 27th April 1809, Mr. Smith and his party embarked from Bombay in the country ship Maria, accompanied by cruisers and armed gallivats[6] with the determined idea of checking the arrogance and superiority of the Amirs in its infancy[7] and establishing the "proper relative ranks of the British and Sindhian Governments."[8] On the 9th May, the Maria was received at Karachi with salutation of guns and the Nawab welcomed the envoy with presents of sheep and vegetable,[9] receiving in return a sharp reprimand for improper

1. Postans.
2. Postans; Napier; Burton. Hughes says that concessions were rudely withdrawn by Sarfraz Khan.
3. Postans; Burton.
4. Eastwick; Aitkens. The Blue Book makes no mention of it.
5. Eastwick. Pottinger says the treaty was entered into through misconception of instructions.
6. Pottinger.
7. Pottinger.
8. Eastwick.
9. Pottinger.

assumptions.[1] The Sindhians were, naturally, alarmed by the presence in their harbour of armed ships and the Nawab tried to get in touch with Hyderabad. A letter received from the Amirs at this time was returned, "accompanied by a polite communication, acquainting the Amirs that it contained not merely an unwarrantable assumption of rank on their part but want of due acknowledgement of that of the exalted Government etc."[2] The party at last reached Hyderabad, where Mr. Smith again tried to dispense with the customary forms of etiquette observed at oriental courts, demanding that he should be provided with a chair at the audience and that the Amirs should rise on the entrance of the mission. In spite of these indignities, the Amirs received him cordially and the tedious and trying negotiations ended in the drawing up of a treaty, which provided for eternal friendship, mutual exchange of vakils and expulsion of the tribe of the French.[3]

"An indifferent reader may smile at the complaints then uttered of the jealousy and suspicion of the Amirs when he learns that at the very moment we were sending an ambassador to the court of Sind with expressions of friendship and good-will, our envoy at Kabul was proposing to the Governor-General to subjugate the country, pay over a large portion of its revenues to its natural and implacable foe and incorporate the territory with the British possessions in India."[4] Nor were these suspicions likely to be removed by the invasion of Cutch in 1816 and its final occupation in 1819, bordering as it does on Sind and at one time almost incorporated with it by Ghulam Shah Kalhora.[5] The subjugation of Cutch led to a renewed treaty[6] with Sind in 1820, with a view to guard against the occurrence of frontier disputes and to strengthen the friendship already subsisting. The treaty also excluded Europeans and Americans from Sind. Nothing further occurred till 1825, when 5,000 or 6,000 British soldiers were assembled in Cutch as a demonstration against the "former great annoyance given to our ally the Rajah of Cutch"[7] and the alleged incursions of predatory tribes into the desert between Sind and Gujrat.

In 1828, Dr. Burnes, brother of the celebrated Sir Alexander Burnes, was invited by the Amirs to visit the court of Sind and treat Mir Mohammed Ali Khan who had been troubled by a carbuncle. The doctor was treated with the utmost kindness and when he returned to Cutch he spoke of the Amirs in glowing terms, extolling their kindness, cleanliness,

1. Pottinger.
2. Pottinger.
3. *Blue Book.*
4. Eastwick.
5. Eastwick.
6. *Blue Book.*
7. Postans.

generosity, forbearance and temperance as anyone living intimately with them could not fail to do.[1]

For some time past, the authorities in England and India had been anxious to get detailed information regarding the river Indus, but had been prevented from prosecuting their design by the fear of exciting the alarms and jealousy of the rulers of Sind.[2] One such expedition had already been planned and abandoned.[3]

By the end of 1830, however, an opportunity presented itself in the shape of a present of five horses from the King of England to Ranjit Singh the chieftain at Lahore; and Alexander Burnes was immediately ordered to proceed to the Sikh capital by way of the river Indus.[4] On the suggestion of Col. Pottinger, a large carriage was included among the presents, to anticipate the objection of the Amirs, for it was obvious that an article of such proportion could only be conveyed by water.[5] The Amirs' agents at first tried to prevent the passage of the mission up the river considering it a breach of the former treaty. "The Amirs were," says Eastwick," all along aware of the real object of our visit." The mission was, however allowed to proceed at the intervention of Mir Nasir Khan son of Mir Murad Ali[6], and the envoy was received at Hyderabad with the utmost courtesy.[7]

Mir Rustam Khan, the venerable patriarch of Khairpur, evinced a still greater desire to please, despatching confidential servants eighty miles to meet the envoy. The mission was entirely successful in its object, and a full and comprehensive report on the river Indus was for the first time given to the world.[8] The voyage was also remarkable for the curiously prophetic apprehensions of the Sindis, one of whom (a Syed) remarked, "Alas! Sind is now gone, since the English have seen the river which is the road to its conquest."[9]

The knowledge thus gained was naturally succeeded by the very legitimate and humane desire of opening up the river Indus to commerce; and Lord William Bentinck himself began to take a personal interest in the achievement of that object.[10] Lt. H. Pottinger, who had accompanied N. H. Smith's mission in 1809, was chosen to conduct the delicate task, and the result was highly gratifying. In addition to the treaties[11] obtained, an

1. Burnes, *Visit to the Court of Scinde.*
2. Alexander Burnes, *Travels into Bokhara.*
3. Burnes.
4. Burnes, Hughes; Aitkens; Napier; Burton; Eastwick.
5. Burnes' *Travels.*
6. Mir Nasir's letter to the Court of Directors; *Blue Book.*
7. Burnes' *Travels.*
8. Burnes' *Travels.*
9. Burnes' *Travels.*
10. Pottinger; Napier Burton; Postans.
11. *Blue Book*

accurate report and survey of the river was made by Lt. del'Hoste. All the former bonds of amity were ratified and "the two contracting parties bound themselves never to look with the eye of covetousness on the possessions of each other." The British Government requested a passage for the merchants and traders of Hindustan by the river and roads of Sind etc., and the Government of Hyderabad acquiesced to the said request on the following conditions: (1) that no person shall bring any description of military stores by the above river or roads; (2) no armed vessels or boats shall come by the river; (3) no English merchant shall be allowed to settle in Sind etc.[1] A fixed scale of tolls and duties was to be promulgated and adhered to. By the commercial treary of 1834[2] tolls were fixed and apportionment thereof made between the Sindian chief, Bahawal Khan and Ranjit Singh. For the better adjustment of any differences that migh arise, a British agent under the authority of Col. Pottinger was allowed to remain at the mouth of the river Indus.

The result of the treaties of 1832 and 1834 was the opening up of the river Indus to commerce. Major-General Napier, in defence of this policy, says, "It is an injury and injustice, if a nation, profiting from its geographical position, seals the navigation of a river to those above or below."

In 1835 Col. Pottinger succeeded with great difficulty in obtaining from the unwilling Amirs a still further permission to survey the sea-coast of Sind, and the delta of the Indus[3]; and for this purpose a steam-boat—the private property of a Moghul merchant named Agha Mohammed Rahim[4]—was despatched to the celebrated river for the first time. An Indus Steam Navigation Company[5] was formed in England and agents despatched to Bombay; but the project did not materialise.

"Lasting and irrevocable friendship had been the heading of every treaty —— —— and in 1836 the Anglo-Indian Government commenced a direct and peremptory interference with the affairs of Scinde; an interference not founded on commercial interests."[6] At this time, the influence of Russia was increasing in Central Asia by leaps and bounds, and Lord Auckland thought friendship with the Afghan people would be the surest way of counteracting the hostility of the Czar. "The ruler of Punjab was too wary and too powerful to be coerced into furtherance of this plan, but the weakness of Scinde offered facilities not to be over looked ————." This was certainly an approach to the abuse of superior power but founded on the instinct of self-preservation not the desire of

1. Other articles relate to passports, tolls, exchange of vakeels etc.; see also supplementary treaty in the *Blue Book*.
2. *Blue Book*.
3. Postan; Napier; Burton; Hughes.
4. Napier; Postans; Wood's *River Oxus*.
5. Postans; Napier.
6. Napier.

aggrandisement etc. But where interest pressed, when did a powerful nation ever scrupulously regard the rights of a weak one?[1] "We now come to the political events which led to subsequent, more questionable treaties."[2]

Ranjit Singh, who had long been coveting the rich town of Shikarpur and the fertile lands towards the north-east, under pretext of chastising the predatory tribe of Mazaris commenced hostilities in 1836 by capturing the town of Rohjan on the north-east frontier of Sind and threatened a regular invasion.[3] "Considering the great courage and barbaric skill of the Scindian Balooches," says Napier,[4] "it is by no means certain that he would have succeeded, and it is certain the Amirs neither desired nor asked for foreign aid against him." They had confidence in their own power and strength. "We have vanquished the Sikhs and will do so again." said the Chief Amir. Ranjit, now with characteristic audacity, demanded from the Anglo-Indian Government a large supply of arms and ammunition to be sent up to him through the river Indus and the territories he was going to invade! By coercion and persuasion, Ranjit was induced to suspend his hostile activities and Col. Pottinger was deputed from Cutch to take the best advantage of the Sindhians' predicament. The Amirs were offered protection and a British force paid by themselves to be stationed in their capital.[5] The force was actually assembled at Bombay[6], but better sense prevailed with Lord Auckland and the proposal was modified. On the 20th April 1838, the treaty[7] was concluded and the Governor-General-in-Council, in consideration of long friendship, agreed to use his good offices to adjust the differences subsisting between the Amirs and Maharaja Ranjit Singh. The grateful Amirs, in return, allowed a British minister to reside at their court and to change his ordinary place of residence from time to time, attended by such an escort as may be deemed suitable by his Government. "This was the frst open encroachment on the independence of the Amirs. It is impossible to mistake or deny the injustice. Analyse the negotiations. The Sikh monarch menaced Scinde with invasion; the danger was imminent and the Anglo-Indian Government seized that moment of fear and difficulty to offer protection, on condition of permanently occupying the capital with British troops to be paid by the Amirs! Was not this simply an impudent attempt to steal away their country? The modified proposal to mediate which followed, was more

1. Napier.
2. Aitkens.
3. Napier.
4. Aitkens says, *the Amirs unable to resist him by force accepted the British mediation.*
5. Napier.
6. Napier
7. *Blue Book.*

subtle, not less immoral; the intent in both cases was profit, covered with a sickening declaration about friendship, justice and love of peace," says Napier. In the meantime, events had been occurring in the far north, which agitated the whole country and had their repercussions in Sind.

On the north-west frontier of India lies a small, rugged, mountainous country, intersected by rich and fertile valleys smiling with fruit and corn, which has had more influence on the destiny of India than perhaps any other country in the world. The Kabul monarchy, with which we are now concerned, arose out of the dismemberment of the empire of Nadir Shah, following his assasination in 1747.[1] On the death of Nadir, Ahmad Shah, the founder of the Durani house, (then 23 years old), seized the reins of government and was crowned king at Kandahar. He left to his son Timour a vast and well-knit empire extending from the Oxus to the sea. Timour transferred his seat of government from Kandahar to Kabul and was succeeded by one of his youngest sons Zeman Shah. Zeman was blinded and dethroned by his brother Mahmud, who, in turn, was dethroned but not blinded by his brother, the celebrated Shah Shuja-ul-Mulk. The Shah ruled for seven years in the teeth of general opposition and popular discontent, till he was driven out by Fateh Khan, chief of the great Barukzye family. Shah Shuja now threw himself on the protection of Ranjit Singh, who, soon getting wearied of his unfortunate guest, imprisoned and ill-treated him in order to extort from him valuable jewels including the famous Koh-i-noor.[3] Shah Shuja at length contrived to escape with his harem to Ludhiana[4], where he remained as a prisoner of the British. After his flight, Fateh Khan became the virtual ruler; but Mahmud, the puppet king, getting jealous of his power and infuence, blinded and killed him. The death of the old vizier was the signal for dismemberment of the Durani empire. Mahmud and his son were driven out. Dost Mahommed, brother of Fateh Khan, became the king of Kabul; Kamran seized Herat, Kandahar passed on to the Sirdars, and Sind became independent.

Matters continued thus, until the fears of the Indian Government about Russian influence were brought to a head by the siege of Herat in 1837. Endeavours were made to win Dost Mahommed who was willing to embrace a British alliance on condition of protection against the encroachments of Ranjit Singh; but it was considered impolitic to offend the Sikh

1. Buist, Allen's *Diary*, Hough, etc.
2. Allen.
3. Allen.
4. *Frerenamah* says that Shah Shuja fled to Jalalabad and from Jalalabad he came secretly to Hyderabad.

chieftain. In an evil hour, it was decided to remove Dost Mahommed and place the fugitive monarch (Shah Shuja) on the Afghan throne. A tripartite treaty[2] was drawn up with Shah Shuja and Ranjit Singh in June 1838. According to it, the Shah agreed to relinquish all claim to supremacy and tribute from Sind on condition of receiving a large sum of money to be determined under mediation of the British Government, out of which fifteen lacs were to be paid to Ranjit Singh. Col. Pottinger, now Resident in Sind, was asked in "shamelessly explicit" instructions to tell the Amirs that Shah Shuja would be at Shikarpur in November and that arrears of tribute must be paid or Shikarpur would be seized. He was also to announce suspension of the article forbidding transport of military stores by the river Indus.[3]

The restoration of Shah Shuja having been determined upon, a large British force was despatched from Bengal with instructions to effect a junction with the Bombay troops under Sir John Keane, the Commander in-chief at Shikarpur, the principal rendezvous, and then proceed to Kandahar through the Bolan Pass. The nearest course would have been through the Sikh territory but the insurmountable objections of our "ancient ally" Ranjit Singh to the passage of a formidable force through the heart of his country, compelled the authorities to take the western route. In December 1838, the whole of the Bombay army, consisting of 5,500 troops[4], laanded at the Hujamri mouth of the river Indus, where it was detained for nearly twenty days, owing to want of supplies and means of conveyance, attributable to the obstacles thrown in the way by the Sindhian Durbar. Before the arrival of these troops, Col. Pottinger had been in attendance upon the Amirs at Hyderabad for preliminary arrangements and Mir Nur Mahomed, in spite of the general opposition of the Baluch Sirdars and other Amirs had promised a safe passage and all necessary assistance. There was however, general discontent, and Col. Pottinger was pelted with stones by boys in the streets of Hyderabad. "But the truth is," says Postans, "they disliked from the first our making a road through their territories and only did not deny it at once when demanded from fear of incurring our displeasure." Again: "From this period it became absolutely necessary to adopt a different course and to demand as a right that which was refused as a favour." Camels and supplies were, however, soon procured by Col. Outram with the assistance of the Raja of Cutch and Seth Naumal, a "wealthy banya" of Sind.

1. Hughes, Aitkens, *Blue Book*, Burton.
2. Napier.
3. Hughes, Bruce.
4. Buist

With great difficulty the troops at length reached Thatha, and while the army was still there, Col. Outram and Eastwick were sent to Hyderabad to tender the treaty. On 22nd January, they had an interview with the Amirs. Mir Nur Mahomed, producing a box from which he took out all the previous treaties, said, "What is to become of all these..... , since Sindh has been connected with the English, there has always been something now. Government is never satisfied; we are anxious for your friendship but we cannot be continually persecuted. We have given a road to your troops and now you wish to remain. This the Baluchis will never suffer. But still we might arrange this were we certain that we would not be harassed with other demands. But the Amirs did not give a definite reply and the envoys, returned to the camp through the ever increasing throngs of armed Baluchis, restrained from giving vent to their feelings by the presence of the escort. Public feeling had run very high and more than 16,000 men had gathered near Hyderabad to attack the English force. The Amirs had to spend over five lacs of rupees from their pockets to check their enthusiasm, and Mir Sher Mahomed, who had expressed his determination to oppose the English and had actually arrived with 12,000 men, was prevailed upon to retire by earnest and repeated entreaties of his friend Mir Sobdar. In the meantime the Amirs had obtained some knowledge of the tripartite treaty[1] and their indignation was naturally great. On the 31st evening, news was brought that the Baluch rabble had plundered the granaries at Hyderabad.[2]

The army was now put in motion and advanced menacingly upon Hyderabad. A detachment of the Bengal army,[3] which had reached Rohri was also ordered to march down upon the capital and co operate with the Bombay column in reducing the fort. Shah Shuja with 6,000 men moved down from Shikarpur and occupied Larkana.[4] At the same time, to overawe the Amirs and form a basis for troops in advance,[5] a reserve force of 5,000 troops[6] was despatched from Bombay, reaching Karachi on 3rd February. They were informed by a fisherman that it was one of the strongest forts in Lower Sind defended by one of the Amirs in person with 3,000 men. "Some slight opposition[7] shown to this movement by a Baluchi guard stationed at Fort Manora called for a brisk cannonade from the admiral's ship (Wellesley), protecting the landing of troops, and the

(1) *Frerenamah*; Napier.

(2) Aitkens; Outram. Napier says, "Rendered furious by these menacing movements, the plundered the stores etc." *Frerenamah* says that Nur Mahomed and his brothers, hearing of these outrages tried their best to check the wild Baloochis and with great difficulty succeeded in quieting them, after they had shaved the beards and cut the ears of a good many of them.

(3) Sir Willoughby Cotton had started before he got orders.

(4) Letter to Secret Committee.

(5) Postans.

(6) Buist.

(7) Aitkens; Hughes; Outram.

place was soon in possession of the British."[1] The walls were levelled within an hour[2] by the first broadside of the men-of-war without troops firing a single shot. The garrison was captured while endeavouring to escape and was found to consist of no more than 20 men!

On the 21st February, the Amirs, finding their capital hemmed in on all sides[3], sent a deputation to intimate that they had resolved to submit, to the treaty, adding that the plundering of granaries was in opposition to their authority and that many persons had been killed in an attempt to prevent it. They further promised to make good the loss so sustained and requested a few alterations in the treaty.

On 10th February, 1839, the army resumed its march after having compelled the Amirs to agree to the payment of 23 lacs of rupees[4] in commutation of all arrears of tribute due to the Kabul throne, 10 lacs being paid on the spot.[5] The treaty was actually signed on 11th March, the Amirs at the same time sending the infirm vizier Ismail Shah to the Governor-General at Simla to appeal; but the old man was taken ill and returned only to die.[6] The terms of the new treaty[7] were: the revision of former treaties; lasting friendship; a British force not exceeding 5,000 men to be stationed in Sind and places for its cantonments; the three Amirs (Nur Mahomed, Nasir Mahomed and Mir Mahomed) to pay one lac of rupees each annually, Mir Sobdar being exempted on account of his undeviating attachment. The Amirs were to rule absolutely in their possessions without interference on the part of the British Government, and the British representative was to mediate in case of differences between the Amirs. The Company's rupee was legalised in Sind, and all tolls on trading boats were abolished. "This treaty is binding on both the parties and their successors for ever."

"The guarantee of independence here," says Postans, "is a new feature in the position of the Sindhian durbar (!); for hitherto it was beyond a doubt a tributary to the Kabul throne, though it had long evaded the acknowledgment; nor had it been demanded. Sind paid a nominal respect by despatch of vakils and interchange of messages of friendship to the Barukzye chiefs as also the rulers of Punjaub and Bahawalpur, but nothing more."

Regarding this tribute to Shah Shuja, Lt. Eastwick has the following observations to make: "It happens, however, that so long back as 1809 the Governor-General had acknowledged that the claims of the Afghans

1. Postans. Karachi was taken after the Amirs had agreed to sign the treaty.
2. Within a quarter of an hour, says Ferenamah.
3. Hughes. Aitkens says the treaty was presented at the point of bayonet.
4. 'The amount, if claimable, would have been double that sum,' says Postans.
5. G-G's Letter to the Secret Committee.
6. Postans, Napier.
7. *Blue Book*, Aitkens.

for tribute from Sind were obsolete. It is true that on one or two occasions Shah Shuja at the head of an army had extorted sums of money from the Amirs on pretence of tribute anciently exacted. He was, however, wholly unable to enforce such demands without our aid and the Amirs produced, moreover, two releases from all future demands on this score, written in the Quran and sealed and signed by His Majesty. Our Resident confessed himself very much puzzled by these documents and, out of that regard which all honourable persons ought to have for their character before the world, it was felt absolutely necessary to suppress them."

Soon after this, Mir Sher Mahomed of Mirpur, in spite of his previous hostility, requested to be admitted to a treaty and was allowed on payment of Rs. 50,000 annually to a participation of the terms granted to other Amirs.[1]

"But it is in our dealings with Mir Rustam that the integrity and the good faith of the British character shone pre-eminent," says Eastwick, "and while the Hyderabad family was thus writhing in Pottinger's grasp, Sir Alexander Burnes' equally strong but more courtly hand was upon the family of Khairpur; and it was now said that all the Amirs had designed to march on Kandahar if the Persians had taken Herat." Burnes was going on a mission to the Prince of Kelat, when he was ordered to turn aside and negotiate a treaty with the Khairpur Amirs as he passed.[3] He was instructed to demand money and a loan of the rock fortress of Bukhar and evade all questions as to remuneration.[4] In reply to the Governor-General's letter of instructions, Burnes suggested the seizure of the fort as soon as the loan of it was given on the ground that the Government had covenanted not to appropriate the possessions of the Amirs on both sides of the river but said nothing of the islands. "This must be confessed to be a felicitous thought and one worthy of a Christian diplomatist."[5] The aged Amir at first, refused to walk into the net and offered counter treaties, but what with the danger of the Sikhs menacing his frontier and promises of independence, he was at last induced to sign the treaty which bears the date of 25th December, 1838. The Amir also agreed, after a sore mental struggle which led him to contemplate suicide, to cede Bukhar[6], "the heart of his country," at the same time throwing himself on the protection of the British.

1. Postans; Hughes.
2. Napier.
3. Napier.
4. Bruce.
5. Eastwick.

6. 'The consternation caused by this declaration was very great; the Amir first offered another fort in its stead, next to find security that our treasure and munitions were protected; but the moonshee, as instructed, replied to all that nothing but the unqualified cession of the fortress of Bakhar during the War would satisfy me. He said it was the heart of his country—his honour was centred in keeping it—his family and children would have no confidence if it were given up.'
Burnes' *Letter to the G-G.*

The three armies now advanced towards Kandahar. With the details of that expedition we are not here concerned. Suffice it to know that Kabul, Kandahar and Ghazni were duly conquered, and the phantom monarch installed on the throne with due pomp A portion of the victorious army returned to India, and the Government now tried to cultivate peaceable relations with the Amirs with a view to reconcile them to the new conditions.[1] The Amirs, on their part, remained friendly and when a serious rebellion,[2] culminating in the murder of a British officer, broke out at Kelat towards the end of 1840, they rendered every assistance by furnishing guides and supplies; and large bodies of British troops were rushed hither and thither without the slightest opposition.[3] "But in justice to them it must be said that, when our fortune turned and the news spread over all India of successive disasters in Afghanistan and their opportunity appeared to have arrived, not only did they refrain from active hostility but some of them materially assisted us."[4] This forbearance is generally attributed to the marvellous influence, tact, and liberal policy of Major Outram, who had now succeeded Col. Pottinger as Resident.[5]

But misunderstandings had already begun. There had been disputes as to the interpretation of some articles of the treaty and delays in payment of tribute. The Amirs were also suspected of treacherous intrigues and Major Outram, who had already started collecting proofs, which he afterwards declared to be groundless[6], determined to have a revision of the treaties[7] which altered circumstances necessitated. The Afghan storm had blown over and Lord Ellenborough with his policy of land for money had now succeeded Lord Auckland.

About this time, unfortunately, domestic quarrels broke out between the Amirs, in order to understand which and their influence on the course of future events, it is necessary to give a brief history[8] of the rise of the Amirs to power and the several branches into which they were afterwards sub-divided.

The Talpurs[9] rose to eminence from humble beginnings, having originally been a tribe of shepherds which immigrated into Sind from countries bordering on her north-west frontier. They came into prominence

1. Hughes; Postans.
2. Hughes; Postans.
3. Postans.
4. Aitkens.
5. Aitkens; Burton; Postans; Hughes.
6. Outram's *Commentary*.
7. Aitkins; Outram; Hughes.
8. Napier says he deprived the Amirs of their country because they were usurpers.
9. This account is based on Burton, Aitkins, Hughes, Postans, Outram's *Campaign*, Napier, Eastwick, and Burnes. The Amirs themselves traced their origin from Arabia. See *Narrative of Mir Nasir Khan.*

during the rule of the Kalhora princes—a dynasty of derv'shes which governed Sind for forty-six years. In 1774, Sarfaraz Khan, the capricious tyrant of Sind, caused Bahram Khan, the head of the Talpurs and one of the most illustrious chiefs of Sind, to be murdered. This barbarous action led to the dethronement of the tyrant, but one of his successors, Ghulam Nabi, undeterred by the punishment which had followed his predecessor's crime, prepared to destroy the surviving son of the murdered chief, who had gone to Mecca, by intriguing with the Arabs of Muscat. Mir Bijar, however, returned from pilgrimage and defeated Ghualm Nabi who was killed in the battle. But the victor, though all Sind lay at his feet, now transferred his allegiance to Abdul Nabi, the brother of the tyrant. No experience could, however, make the ill-fated Kalhoras wise. The ungrateful prince, feeling jealous of his powerful subject's influence, caused him to be treacherously murdered. All Sind now rose to a man and drove the cruel and perfidious Kalhora from the land. Mir Fateh Ali Khan, the eldest of the Amirs, whose bravery had been chiefly instrumental in bringing about the change, was by the general voice called to the helm of affairs. But in trying to consolidate his position, he so alarmed his nephew Sohrab (who had marched with him upon Hyderabad) and Mir Thara his cousin that they threw off his allegiance, possessed themselves of portions of the conquered territory and established independent principalities. In 1786, the Amirs were confirmed in their sovereignty by the patent of Timour Shah.

Mir Fateh Ali Khan now ruled at Hyderabad along with his three brothers Ghulam Ali, Karm Ali and Murad Ali, whom he had on his elevation admitted to participation in his high office. Henceforth the four reigned together, evincing strong and unvarying attachment for each other, which gained them the honourable appellation of the "Chahar Yar" or Four Friends. Fateh Ali died leaving his son Sobdar; but the turban passed on to his brother Ghulam Ali who left a son named Mahomed Khan. Karm Ali left no issue, and Murad Ali was succeeded by his sons Mirs Nur Mahommed and Nasir Mahommed.

Mir Tharo of Mirpur left Ali Murad, who was succeeded by his son Sher Mahommed, the "Lion" of Sir Charles Napier's despatches. The Khairpur Amir left several sons, chief among them being Mir Rustam, Mir Mubarak, and Mir Ali Murad.

On the death of Mir Nur Mahommed, son of Murad Ali, there was a dispute as to succession between his two sons at Hyderabad, but it was amicably settled by the timely intervention of Major Outram.[1]

1. Postans.

Major Outram was now removed from Sind and Sir Charles Napier was given the sole military and political command of Lower Sind.[1] This nervous little old gentleman, who despised "smart lads who speak Hindustani and Persian, misnamed political agents," had conjured up, before he came to Sind, a vast conspiracy of Afghans, Brohis, Balochis and Talpurs with an army of 200,000 men banded together with the sole object of destroying British power in the East; and he now determined to crush it. He easily grasped the situation and said, 'We have no right to seize Sind. Yet, we shall do so and a very advantageous, humane, and useful piece of rascality it will be.'[2] He had instructions from Lord Ellenborough to keep possession of Karachi and to inflict a signal punishment on any of the Amirs who "may have evinced hostile feelings against us."[3] On the 3rd September 1842, "old Oliver's fortunate day"[4] he embarked at Bombay in the Zenobia and landed at Karachi on the 10th, where his leg was injured by the bursting of a rocket train. On the 19th he reached Hyderabad, where a princely reception awaited him, the Amirs sending an open, high-arched palanquin of crimson and gold with green cushions for his use and richly caparisoned camels for his staff. In consideration of his torn leg, the durbar was held in the court down below to save him the pain of ascending their great staircase. Sweetmeats and provisions were presented after the manner of their court and compliments exchanged. But the general had not come to bandy words. "Hence, he put aside all thoughts of their flattering attentions, and frankly and honourably, even in the midst of their grandeur and while the flow of their politeness seemed to invite friendship, gave them an austere but timely and useful warning that the previous unsteady policy of diplomatic agents in Scinde would no longer facilitate deceitful practices against the tenour of international obligations."[5] His brother the historian tells us that he had already obtained proofs of the Amirs' disloyalty at Karachi. Accordingly, he addressed to them a letter, penned in the dictatorial and offensive tone which pervaded all his negotiations, without any complimentary preamble deemed essential in all political correspondence, and specifying the charges which were as follows; (1) that the Amirs had prohibited inhabitants of Karachi (a town belonging to them) to settle in the bazar (of the British cantonment); (2) that they had ordered everything landed at the bunder (their own wharf) to be taken to the customs house; (3) that they levied tolls on boats belonging to the subjects of Sind. Major Outram, who carefully went into these charges, has clearly shown that the Amirs were strictly within their rights both by treaties as well as on moral and international grounds. But the fact is that the general, as he himself said, "wanted a fair pretext to coerce the Amirs." From Hyderabad, the general

1. Burton; Hughes; Aitkens, Napier.
2. Aitkens.
3. Burton,
4. Bruce, *Life of Napier*; Napier.
5. Napier.

hurriedly passed on to Sukhar, where he spent some time in getting his small army into fighting trim[1] and investigating the charges against the Amir of Khairpur.[2] The offences with which the Amir was charged were: (1) the authorising of certain hostile letters[3]; (2) levying of tolls from his own subjects; (3) seizure of British subjects, released on demand but no reparation made; (4) escape of Mahommed Sharif with the aid of Mir Rustam and (5) maltreatment by an agent of the Amir of a servant of a British officer.

These charges were equally frivolous and no opportunity was given to the Amirs of refuting them. The hostile letters were never proved, as they were a forgery. "But the more closely I investigated the charge of hostile negotiations, which the accused parties resolutely denied, the greater appeared the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of proving the authenticity of intercepted letters on which it was founded."[4] Again: "No legal proof of the authenticity of the document was obtained."[5] But the General was convinced. "I was resolved, when there was a breach of treaty, whether great or small, I would hold all the Amirs responsible and would not be played off like a shuttle-cock and told this was done by one Amir and that by another and so have a week's inquiry to find out who was responsible for the aggression."[6]

In the meantime, the Amirs got information of new treaties intended to be inflicted on them.[7] Their suspicions were further confirmed by the augmentation of Napier's army by General England's column which had now returned, and bazar gossip did the rest. The political authorities did absolutely nothing to assuage their suspicions or allay their fears The chiefs, who had been exasperated by the treatment meted out to the sirdars of hill tribes by the political agent at Sukhar[8], became nervous and began to take defensive measures.

We now revert to the domestic broils hinted at above. Mir Rustam[9], the Rais of Khairpur was now eighty-five years of age and his death was expected every moment. In ordinary course, the *gadi* would have descended to his eldest son, but his youngest brother Ali Murad, "crafty,

1. Aitkens.
2. Aitkens.
3. The letters were supposed to have been written by the Amirs to Sanwalmal, of Multan and the chief of the Beebruck tribe. Mir Nasir resolutely denied all knowledge of them. They were of course never proved.
4. Outram.
5. Outram.
6. Napier.
7. Aitkens.
8. Burton.
9. Napier and Burton delight to call this venerable man a debauched old prince in state of dotage.

ambitious, and unprincipled[1]" coveted it for himself. So far he had stood ostentatiously aloof; but now he came to the general to solicit his good offices[2] and was promised support.

On 4th and 6th December Sir Charles caused the drafts of the new treaties to be tendered[3] to the Amirs of Khairpur and Hyderabad respectively. The former was called upon to cede in perpetuity the *pergunnah* of Bhoong Bhara and a part of the district of Subzulcote to His Highness the Nawab of Bahawalpur, and Sukkar and the island of Bukkar, with the adjoining islets, to the British Government. The terms of the Hyderabad treaty were as follows: the Amirs were relieved from payment of tribute: the coin legally current in the dominions of the Amirs would be the Company's rupee; the British Government would coin for the Amirs rupees bearing the effigy of the sovereign of England; the Amirs renounced the privilege of coining money; the Government would have the right to fell wood within one hundred yards of the banks of the Indus; Karachi, Thatha and Subzulcote ceded in perpetuity.

"It will be seen that these measures were not calculated to be palatable to Sindian chiefs; for, independently of the loss of revenue which the cession of such important territories as these must have occasioned, a portion being made over to a foreign and inferior power, the dignity of the whole Baluch faction was most vitally assailed: whilst a most important point to the Amirs was at length decided against them in the infringement of their game preserves, an immediate result of our taking territory on both banks of the river."[4] The terms not only vitally infringed the rights of the Amirs and their Baluch jagirdars and feudatories but seriously interfered with the prescriptive and long established order of things. Moreover the Amirs objected to the Queen's effigy on religious grounds, the use of such emblems having been prohibited by their Prophet.

But the Amirs, who were allowed short time for debate or council, after twice sending agents[5] to the general, representing loss of revenue and respect which the acceptance of the terms imposed would entail upon them, signified their willingness to submit under protest to the 'new treaty'.[6] On 8th December, before the treaty was ratified, Sir Charles Napier issued a proclamation[7], intimating his intention of seizing the territories ceded to the Nawab and forbidding payment of revenue to the Amir's kardars. The proclamation was followed by arrogant letters threatening the capital with

1. Burton.
2. Burton; Aitken; Hughes; Napier; Outram.
3. Aitkens.
4. Postans.
5. Burton.
6. Outram; Aitkens.
7. Aitkens.

destruction.[1] A few days later, the general crossed the Indus with his army and took the field.[2] Mir Rustam, feeble in mind and body and distracted by his brother's plots, was at his wit's end to guess the meaning of all this. He wrote[3] to the general to say that he would come to his camp and throw himself on his protection. But the general advised him[4] through Ali Murad, who was at this time in his camp, to listen to his brother's advice and trust himself, to his care. Rustam now betook himself, with his wives and attendants, to Ali Murad's fort of Diji and the general was informed[5] a few days later that he had, by a solemn engagement written on the Quran, resigned his turban and territories to him. It transpired afterwards that Ali Murad had, while his aged brother was with him, confined and ill-treated him and taken his seal by force. The general now expressed his intention of advancing upon Diji, whereupon Rustam immediately fled to the desert with a few personal followers, his wily brother, who wanted to eliminate all chances of a personal explanation, having scared the old man with fears of being made prisoner by the British.[6] Ali Murad, then, seized upon Khairpur and took possession of all that belonged to Rustam.[7] Sir Charles Napier was now offended at Rustam's flight and thought he had gone with his treasure to join his sons in the desert. He now resolved to "impress the Baloochis with a wholesome conviction that their deserts could not protect them against British troops"[8] and undertook a most quixotic expedition, which his brother is pleased to compare with the campaign of Alexander the Great two thousand years ago in the same country—with only this difference, that Alexander was only five days in the desert while the English general was eighteen[9]—to Imamgarh, the "Gibraltar of Sindh," as he pompously styled it. Major Outram, who had been recalled at the earnest desire of Sir Charles Napier, himself "ignorant of India, its people, its languages, unversed in diplomacy and impatient of forms,"[10] after meeting the General at Diji, now proceeded to Mir Rustam's camp alone and brought the chief's son and nephew to the general's presence.[11] But nothing could now avert the coming storm.[12] On the 12th January, after forced marches worthy of a better cause, he reached Imamgarh, which he found deserted, blew it up with gunpowder stored within its

1. Burton; Hughes.
2. Burton.
3. Aitkens; Hughes; Napier and Outram.
4. Aitkens; Napier and Outram.
5. Aitkens; Napier.
6. Mir Rustam's Letter to Napier; Aitkens. Hughes says "Ali Murad made false representations to the general as well."
7. Aitkens.
8. Napier; Aitkens.
9. Napier.
10. Outram; Aitkens.
11. Burton.
12. Burton.

walls[1], and returned in time to deal with the Amirs of Hyderabad. On the other hand, the aged Rustam, beloved of his people, was wandering as a dethroned outcast in his own dominions. "Not only were they, without a fault, fugitives in their own country, but they knew not where to place those in safety—who to Christians and Mussalmans are alike dear—their wives and children. And ladies, who had been nursed in the lap of luxury, were now, like themselves, wanderers and condemned to all the privations and hardships of a fugitive life, in weather so inclement," etc.[2] While flying from the palace, the Kajawas carrying Mir Hassan's mother (Rustam's wife) fell and her arm was broken near the elbow, two female attendants being killed. Mir Rustam was obliged to sell some of his saddles and trappings mounted in gold to procure the means of life for himself and his family.

Sir Charles Napier now marched towards Hyderabad where Major Outram had already preceded him[3], to make "a last effort to save the Amirs." The Amirs sent a deputation to the general at Nandhahra under Mirza Khosro Beg[4], with a message that they were ready to accept the terms of the new treaty provided Mir Rustam, who had now thrown himself on their protection, claiming their hospitality and intercession, and whose cause they were therefore bound in honour to espouse, was restored to his possessions. The old Mirza indulged in some home truths, which exasperated the irritable general. "I am for war," said he. "let us see how the swords of the Baloochis resist volleys of muskets and guns;" and the message was faithfully conveyed.

At Hyderabad Major Outram was joyfully received[5] and the Amirs promised to sign the treaty after the 10th of Moharrum—a sacred month of mourning to the Shias, at the same time appealing for a redress of Rustam's wrongs. Major Outram had of course no authority to open that question. "Then let us settle accounts with Ali Murad ourselves" said they; but the permission was refused. The Amirs wanted even a faint assurance, and delayed in the hope that it would be given, so that they might be able to disperse 30,000 Baluchis, who were clamouring for blood and would have heard no other argument. At last, on the 12th February, the Amirs signed the treaty; and Major Outram sent a special messenger to the general, requesting him to suspend his march.[6] But, in spite of repeated messages,

1. Aitkens; Napier; Burton; Hughes.
2. Eastwick.
3. Burton; Napier's Letter.
4. *Frerenamah*.
5. Read the famous "*Notes of the Conference*" by Outram a document that brought about the quarrel between Sir Charles Napier and Major Outram. But for the quarrel, we should never have known the real facts. Bruce.
6. Outram sent a message to the General at Sakrand by camel supplied by Mir Nasir. The General immediately set out towards Hyderabad, though he had no previous intention of marching. Napier says he rejected Outram's advice because he thought he was benig deceived by the Amirs.

Sir Charles Napier kept advancing menacingly upon Hyderabad. The Baluch tribesmen were now furious and threatened to rise in arms. Just then intelligence arrived that Sir Charles Napier had imprisoned a Murri chief named Hayat Khan without cause. That was the last straw. At night, the Baluch chiefs assembled in a solemn conclave and took an oath that they would attack Major Outram on his return to the Agency. But the Major was safely conducted by a strong escort of horse led by principal chiefs, which the Amirs had provided.[1] Mir Nasir Khan, who had now lost all power over his turbulent subjects and was no longer a free agent, sent repeated messages to him, warning him of his danger and entreating him to retire from the vicinity of Hyderabad.[2]

On the 15th February, a Baluch rabble of 8,000 men mounted on wretched horses, attacked the Residency which was gallantly defended by major Outram and his little band for four hours. At length, they decided to effect their retreat and embarked on board the steamers to join Sir Charles Napier at Hala.

Regarding this attack on the Residency, Major Outram says, "I have, I trust, already satisfied the reader that no intention of massacring myself or my escort ever entered the minds of the Ameers. The general's advance compelled the Belooches to march out in defence of their capital; a necessary military preliminary was to expel me from their rear; and, as the evidence adduced by Sir Charles Napier against the Ameers proves, my expulsion was all that was desired." That the Amirs had no intention of proceeding to extremities is also clear from the fact that they had left all their property and families at Hyderabad.

The Amirs[3], with 17,000 men and 12 guns now occupied a strong position in the dry bed of Fulaili, flanked on either side by thick woods; and the English general advanced with 2,800 men[4] and eight pieces of artillery. The two armies met on the morning of the 17th. The Baluchis fought with desperate resolution but the musket triumphed over the matchlock. The Amirs were defeated with heavy losses.[5]

Next day Mirs Nasir, Shahdad, and Husain Ali, (a boy of sixteen) entered the camp on horseback and offered themselves as prisoners. The general returned their swords, rebuckling them on their waists with his own hands, and spoke kindly to them. They were told that their ultimate disposal rested with the Governor-General, who was being

1. Burton; Postans; Nasir's Letters.
2. Burton; Postans.
3. For accounts of the battle of Miani read Sir Charles Napier's despatch, *Frerenamah* and *An Account of an Eye-witness.*
4. 2,700, says Burton.
5. Their loss is computed at 5,000, while on the side of the British, it did not exceed 257,

communicated with. In the meantime, they would be treated with the indulgence and consideration due to their fallen state. On the following day, Mirs Rustam of Kairpur and Nasir, along with the former's son, also surrendered. Sir Charles Napier now moved with his army to his camp at Nauabad, leaving the Amirs to stay in a garden on the banks of the river, in charge of his secretary.

On the 21st of the same month two English regiments[1] with guns entered the fort, the gate of which had already been secured by a guard to cut off all communications. The Union Jack was hoisted, and the keys of the fort and treasury secured. In three days' time all the treasure, buried or otherwise, in fact everything found in the fort, public or private,[2] had fallen into the hands of Mr. MacPherson and his two colleagues, Mir Nasir's valuables being the most considerable. The looting of the fort had better be described in the words of the Amir[3] himself:—

"At last, Mr. Fallon and Col. Pattle and Major Reid and several other officers, with two regiments of cavalry and infantry entered the fort and seized on all ttreasures, gold, silver, swords, matchlocks, knives, daggers, shields and other property, such as jewels and what else belonged to our establishment, costly fabrics, Qurans and books, horses and camels and mules, saddles of gold and silver, everything in fact of the value of a needle; so complete was the plunder that precious stones were falling out of the bosoms of sepoys and they were selling jewels and other valuables in the city. The work of plunder was continued for seven days; the first day, they rushed into the seraglio of the late Meer Kurum Ali Khan[4]; and the occupants of the seraglio, for fear of their lives and shame lest they should be exposed to the gaze of intruders, abandoning their houses, fled on foot from the fort. Afterwards, the seraglios of other Ameers were entered by the British troops; and their inmates who had never before crossed the threshold of the seraglios, fled on foot from the fort; the sepoys, who were at the gates, on seeing a woman with ornaments on her person, immediately stripped them off, so that those who would avoid exposure threw away their jewels, taking with them only the clothes on their backs. The officers carried off even our cots and beddings, leaving us nothing but the ground. I had taken to the seraglio the books and clothes they (the officers) had given me the day they entered the fort, all of which were again taken from me the day I left; also the swords of my sons, Meer Hossain Ali and Meer Abbass Ali; depriving

1. Burton says the general marched into the capital and seized on all treasures.
2. Aitkens.
3. Mir Nasir's Letter to the Directors.
4. Mir Mahomed and Mir Sobdar prefer similar charges which Napier and his agents deny. But Major Outram believes every word of them. Read his nine questions, beginning with, "If the Ameers were not plundered, what was left to them and their families?"

us also of our bedding. The horses and saddles of gold, on which my sons came to me, were also taken away, notwithstanding my remonstrances to Captain Brown and Ali Akbar ; and to this day they are without swords. Although my sword and matchlock are of iron and of little value, yet having descended to me from my ancestors they are by me prized as my life. Besides that, the late Meer Kurrum Ali Khan and Meer Murad Ali Khan treated Mirza Khosro as a son ; he was imprisoned with us ; one day he was taken to the fort and charged with having misdirected them to the post where the treasure of the late Meer Kurrum Ali Khan was hidden, for which they had him disgraced and flogged until he fainted ; on his recovery he was tied up for two hours in the fort and afterwards brought back to the place where I was imprisoned."

Major Outram further adds that a woman, concubine of one of the officers, was employed to search the ladies belonging to the zenana and stationed at the gate to prevent the possibility of their passing out unsearched ; and that the process of search conducted by her was most indecent.[1]

The total loot is said to have amounted to a million sterling ;[2] indeed much less than the expectations which Burnes' glowing descriptions of the Amirs' wealth and jewellery had inspired in the minds of the prize agents. Sir Charles Napier's share of the Hyderabad plunder alone is reported to have exceeded £70,000 sterling.[3]

On the 23rd,[4] the English general reinforced by troops from Sukkar, started in pursuit of Sher Mahommed, the "Lion," as he called him. The two armies met at Dubba, four miles to the east of Hyderabad. The English were victorious once more, after a combat of three hours. Sher Mahommed fled to the desert, returning years afterwards, when he was allowed to settle in Sind and pensioned.

On the 12th March, before the battle of Dubba had been fought, Lord Ellenborough had issued a proclamation[5] annexing Sind and ordering the Amirs to be sent to Bombay as prisoners. All Sind now lay at the feet of the conqueror who with characteristic contempt for words, worthy of a man of action, and, brevity which would have put Caesar to shame is said to have laconically described his achievements in a single phrase "peccavi," "I have sinned (Sind)"[6]. He was put in political charge of Sind as its first Governor on Rs. 8,000 a month. In 1847 Sind was annexed to the Bombay Presidency, Mr. Pringle being appointed its first Commissioner.

1. *Commentary.*
2. Hughes.
3. Outram, *Commentary.*
4. Read Sir Charles Napier's own account and *Frerenamah.*
5. Aitkens, *Blue Book.*
6. Aitkens and Baillie. Not authentic.

Digitized by M. H. Panhwar Institute of Sindh Studies, Jamshoro.

The rest of the Amirs, who had taken no part in the battles, were also secured and sent to Bombay, where a local journal described their condition as follows:—

"The Ameers, being prisoners of State, are retained in strict seclusion; they are described as broken hearted and miserable men, maintaining much of the dignity of fallen greatness and, without any querulous or angry complainings at this unalleviable source of sorrow, refusing to be comforted."[1]

From Bombay, the Amirs were taken to the village of Sasur near Poona, (where the aged Rustam and his nephew Nasir died) and thence they were deported to Calcutta and Hazaribagh. The survivors returned to Sind in 1854 after an exile of ten years.

From their captivity, the Amirs sent appeals, vakils, memorials and petitions but they all fell on deaf ears. Mir Nasir wrote: "I have read that Christianity is opposed to oppression of every kind, but from the time the British arrived in India to the present day no such tyranny was ever practised as on us. Had a shot been fired from the walls of Hyderabad, the British army might have lawfully plundered it; but, after promising security and making peace, to console us with a promise to restore us to power and afterwards to plunder the treasury, and to disgrace the rulers of the country, is not allowed by any law; and I have heard from experienced persons that it is not the custom of the English to punish a man before he is proved guilty, and not to degrade him on the hearsay evidence of others. I therefore hope that you will first investigate my case, and then determine by the laws of Christianity, whether or not we are suffering from injustice."

An Englishman[2] makes the following impassioned appeal on behalf of the unfortunate princes:—

"Let those whose blood still boils at the tale of Austrian tyranny and Hungarian woes comes here and read of tyranny as gross, of wrongs as unmerited, inflicted on an independent people—and by Englishmen: It cannot be that those who sympathise deeply with every other tale of suffering and of wrong should turn unmoved from this—one of the most piteous that ever was listened to with mingled pity and indignation by Christian men. What! shall savage Dayaks and tribes more wild and barbarous still.....all find their advocates, and none move a hand or utter a voice for our own allies to whose protection we were pledged by solemn and reiterated treaties, for victims, round whom was woven a web of cunning villainy, and who were trapped with falsehoods which now make day hideous by their revelation! Men of England! think of your boasted

1. Quoted by Postans, probably from *The Bombay Times*.
2. Eastwick, *Dry Leaves from Young Egypt*.

freedom and let your pulse beat quick for those who died by your sword in defence of their own liberties and homes, and for that smaller, but far more wretched band, once your friends, once aye! your benefactors, now lingering out a miserable exile in a distant land, whose jailors you now pay, whose hospitality, whose alliance you once sought. Women of England! think of the mothers and sisters of princes, stripped of their ornaments, torn from their homes, driven to wander houseless and friendless in the wild jungles and poisonous swamps of Burdikah. But, if you will not listen, think not that the ears of all nations are closed to those outrages." And then he goes on to describe how Sultan Haji ben Musa Ettani, in the heart of the Great Sahara significantly asked an English traveller (James Richard) "Christian! do you know Sind?"

But the appeals fell on stony soil and bore no fruit. The vakils returned to India, where "they will never cease to send up their prayers to Heaven for justice, in the hope that God will grant what man refuses."[1]

1 Statement of the Ameers' case drawn up by Dewan Metharam.

PRINTED AT THE EDUCATIONAL PRINTING PRESS, KARACHI

Digitized by M. H. Panhwar Institute of Sindh Studies, Jamshoro.